

1 MCGREGOR W. SCOTT
United States Attorney
2 ANGELA SCOTT
Assistant United States Attorney
3 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401
Fresno, CA 93721
4 Telephone: (559) 497-4000
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099
5

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
United States of America
7

8
9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 HEATHER STANLEY,
15 Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00045 NONE-SKO
STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;
[PROPOSED] FINDINGS AND ORDER
(Doc. 19)

16
17 **STIPULATION**

18 This case is set for status conference on June 15, 2020. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued
19 General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California until further
20 notice, and allows district judges to continue all criminal matters. This and previous General Orders
21 were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

22 Although the General Orders address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has
23 emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act's end-of-justice provision "counteract[s] substantive
24 openendedness with procedural strictness," "demand[ing] on-the-record findings" in a particular case.
25 *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). "[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no
26 exclusion under" § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at
27 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a
28 judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record "either orally

1 or in writing”).

2 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory
3 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, and 618 require specific supplementation. Ends-of-
4 justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his
5 findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and
6 the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable
7 unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that
8 the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public
9 and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

10 The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code
11 T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics,
12 natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such
13 circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance
14 following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court
15 recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United*
16 *States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the
17 September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a
18 similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

19 In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following
20 case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-
21 justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).¹ If continued, this Court should designate a new date
22 for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any
23 pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

24 STIPULATION

25 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant
26 HEATHER STANLEY, by and through defendant’s counsel of record, David Torres, hereby stipulate as

27
28 ¹ The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make
“additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D.
Cal. March 18, 2020).

1 follows:

2 1. By previous order, this matter was set for status on June 15, 2020.

3 2. By this stipulation, defendants now move to continue the status conference until
4 September 14, 2020, and to exclude time between June 15, 2020, and September 14, 2020, under Local
5 Code T4.

6 3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

7 a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case
8 includes thousands of pages of reports, photographs, and evidence obtained pursuant to an email
9 search warrant. This discovery has been produced directly to counsel.

10 b) Counsel for defendant desires additional time to consult with his client, to review
11 the current charges, to conduct investigation and research related to the charges, to review and
12 copy discovery for this matter, to discuss potential resolutions with his client, to prepare pretrial
13 motions, and to otherwise prepare for trial.

14 c) Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested
15 continuance would deny them the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
16 account the exercise of due diligence.

17 d) The government does not object to the continuance.

18 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the
19 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the
20 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

21 f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,
22 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of June 15, 2020 to September 14,
23 2020, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code
24 T4], because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the
25 basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the
26 best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

27 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the
28 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial

1 must commence.

2 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

3
4 Dated: June 11, 2020

McGREGOR W. SCOTT
United States Attorney

5
6 /s/ ANGELA SCOTT
ANGELA SCOTT
Assistant United States Attorney

7
8
9 Dated: June 11, 2020

/s/ per email authorization
10 DAVID A. TORRES
11 Counsel for Defendant
HEATHER STANLEY

12
13 **[PROPOSED] FINDINGS AND ORDER**

14 The Court finds that the discovery associated with this case is substantial and the defense desires
15 additional time to consult with his client, to review the current charges, to conduct investigation and
16 research related to the charges, to review and copy discovery for this matter, to discuss potential
17 resolutions with his client, to prepare pretrial motions, and to otherwise prepare for trial. The Court finds
18 also that the failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny the defense the reasonable
19 time necessary for effective preparation, considering the exercise of due diligence. Based on these
20 findings and the fact the government does not object to the continuance, the ends of justice are served by
21 continuing the case as requested and they outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial
22 within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 The status conference currently set on June 15, 2020 is CONTINUED to September 14, 2020 at
2 2:30 p.m. The Court excludes time between June 15, 2020, and September 14, 2020, under Local Code
3 T4.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: June 11, 2020

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE